

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

CALVIN LEROY DUNN, #02346222, §  
Petitioner, §  
§  
v. § Case No. 6:23-cv-100-JDK-JDL  
§  
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID, §  
§  
Respondent. §  
§

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Petitioner Calvin Leroy Dunn, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his Van Zandt County conviction. The petition was referred to United States Magistrate Judge, the Honorable John D. Love, for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On February 24, 2025, Judge Love issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that Petitioner's habeas petition be denied as time-barred and the Court dismiss the case with prejudice. Docket No. 15. Judge Love further recommended that the Court deny Petitioner a certificate of appealability *sua sponte*. A copy of this Report was mailed to Petitioner's last-known address. No objections to the Report have been filed, and the time period for filing objections has passed.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and

Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Petitioner did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 15) as the findings of this Court. The Court **ORDERS** that Petitioner's habeas petition is **DENIED** as time-barred, and the case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. Petitioner is further **DENIED** a certificate of appealability *sua sponte*. Any and all motions which may be pending in this case are **DENIED** as moot.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 11th day of **June, 2025**.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE